

LAND USE ECONOMICS

This section is proposed for use in developing the Land Use chapter of the EIR/EIS. The section is currently unbalanced in its presentation of information, and should be more focused on impact assessment. Much more information is presented for the Delta region than for the other regions. Substantial reorganization is recommended for the PEIR/EIS. The Impacts section should be revised to include clear descriptions of each impact, how it occurs, and whether or not it is considered significant (and on what basis). The significance criteria should be more clearly defined and the impacts analyses should relate to those criteria. Although mitigation measures are summarized in the summary, they have been omitted from each alternative analysis. They should be identified as applicable for each of the various impacts.

Conformance to Outline

Land Use Economics

Affected Environment

- Section 4.3 is missing (misc section)

Environmental Consequences

- followed format

REVIEW COMMENTS
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS
LAND USE ECONOMICS

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

No.	Page/Para	Comment
1	General	The section is currently unbalanced in its presentation of information. Much more information is provided for the Delta Region than the other study areas. The level of detail should be consistent for each of the five study areas.
2	General	Terminology might be better located to a glossary
3	General	Regulations appear to focus on the Delta Region—Discussion might be improved if it limited to statewide policies at the beginning then located study area policies by region.
4	General	Develop figures illustrating overall land use make-up for each study area.
5	General	Consistent format should be developed that uses same headings, tables, etc. for each study area.
6	1.0 Summary	Delete—it repeats information located elsewhere in document.
7	2.0 Intro	Edit as indicated.
8	2.0 Intro	Consider putting definitions in an EIS/EIR glossary.
9	3.0 Sources of Info	Add to introduction.
10	4.0 Envir. Setting	Organize by region and move 4.3/4.4/4.5 and 4.6 information into 4.1.
11	4.1.5 SWP and CVP	Unless essential to land use, delete discussion of six individual service areas.
12	4.2 Reg. Context	(See General Comments)
13	4.3 Delta Region	Shorten considerably to match level of detail for the other four regions.
14	4.3 Delta Region	Tables should also be consistent with those provided for the other study areas.
15	4.3 Delta Region	Develop figure illustrating land use categories in the study area.
16	4.4 Bay Region	Develop figure illustrating land use.
17	4.5 Sac. River Region	Develop figure illustrating land uses.
18	4.5 Sac. River Region	Hydrologic regions are introduced and given subheadings for the first time in the section. This is not consistent with other discussions of study areas.
19	4.6 San Joaquin River	Develop figure illustrating land uses.
20	4.6 San Joaquin River	Hydrologic regions are introduced again. Consistent with 4.5, but not consistent with 4.4 and 4.3.
21	4.7 SWP and CVP	Develop figure to illustrate land uses.

9/30/97

1

C - 0 0 4 2 7 9

C-004279

REVIEW COMMENTS
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS
LAND USE ECONOMICS

22	5.0 References	Move to separate chapter in EIS/EIR.
----	-------------------	--------------------------------------

9/30/97

2

C - 0 0 4 2 8 0

C-004280

REVIEW COMMENTS
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS
LAND USE ECONOMICS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ CONSEQUENCES

No.	Page/Para	Comment
1	General	Significance criteria should be clearly identified and impacts should relate to these criteria.
2	General	Impacts should include description of the impact—how does it occur—what does it affect—is it significant or not significant.
3	General	It's usually easier to follow if mitigations follow impacts.
4	General	Section should be reorganized to provide discussion by region for each alternative. e.g., for the No Action Alternative impacts are organized by region. Alternatives I - III should also follow this format.
5	1.0 Intro	Delete except for first paragraph.
6	2.0 Summ. of Effects	Develop table to illustrate impacts.
7	2.3 Summ. of Potential	This could be located in a separate EIS/EIR chapter.
8	3.0 Assess. Process	Delete large portion of the text and move remaining into 1.0 introduction.
9	3.2.2 Level of Detail	Delete
10	2.0 Signif. Criteria	Describe actions that would affect land uses. Combine CEQA and NEPA significance criteria.
11	3.0 Environ. Impacts	Organize by alternative with each region discussed under each alternative
12	3.0 Environ. Impacts	Restructure description of impacts to include: 1.) Statement of the impact (what is it). 2.) Where would it occur? 3.) What would it affect? 4.) Is it significant?
13	3.0 Environ. Impacts	Include mitigations in this section following any significant impacts.
14	3.0 Environ. Impacts	Delete summary of significant impacts. This should already be clear from impacts discussion.
15	Tables 5.3.1 to 5.3.5 (p. 23-51)	These tables could be reformatted to identify impacts by alternative and by region. See marked-up hard-copy.
16	6.0 Related Topics	Delete—not really relevant to the land use discussion.
17	7.0 References	Move to separate EIS/EIR chapter.

9/30/97

3

C - 0 0 4 2 8 1

C-004281